DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 601 CE 009 721

AUTHOR	Cronin, P. Patrick, And Others
TITLE	Improvement of Occupational Education in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Phase II: Regional Workshops.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
REPORT NO	VT-103-543
PUB DATE	Jun 76
CONTRACT	1-PI-2331
NOTE	79p.; For a related document see ED 128 647
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Education; *Inservice Education; Institutional Personnel; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Staff Improvement; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Phase II activities of a project to improve occupational education programs in corrective institutions involved conducting five workshops for 106 selected participants with responsibility for the delivery of occupational education in the Bureau of Prisons (BOP). Specific objectives were to provide a forum of discussion of phase I findings involving the comparative effectiveness of various delivery programs, and to provide staff development training. The report describes the development of the workshop curriculum, selection of participants, and the workshop evaluation procedures. Results are presented as mean ratings of final evaluation items for each workshop site and across sites to show regional and total impact. Overall results indicated that workshop objectives and expectations were met and that participants viewed the proceedings very favorably. Appendixes consist of workshop agenda, participant lists, BOP vocational education course listings, evaluation forms, and daily evaluation results. (NJ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133601

IMPROVEMENT OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

RECEIVED
SEP 22 1976
Info. Acq., CVTE

PHASE II

Regional Workshops

F. Patrick Cronin
Robert E. Abram
Charles M. Whitson
Bruce A. Reinhart

VT-103-543

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

June, 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 009 721

This study was funded under contract with Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, Bureau of Prisons, U. S. Department of Justice. Contractors conducting such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Bureau of Prisons position or policy.

Project funded under contract 1 PI 2331
by Federal Prison Industries, Inc.,
Bureau of Prisons, U. S. Department of Justice

FOREWORD

The modern goal of the correctional system is not only to serve and protect the public through crime prevention, but also to provide offenders with meaningful and relevant education programs in the correctional institution. Since the offender population is typically poor, undereducated, and unemployed, occupational education is viewed as an effective means for providing useful employment skills and knowledge to elevate and expand the offender's chances for success upon release.

In an effort to improve its occupational programs, the Federal Bureau of Prisons contracted with The Center for Vocational Education to design and implement a series of five regional workshops for administration and staff of its correctional institutions. The workshops were developed, in a large part, from findings of The Center's assessment of the comparative effectiveness of various approaches, including the community resource approach, for delivering occupational education in the Bureau's correctional institutions. The workshops involved 106 administrators and staff from 37 correctional institutions. This document is a report of those workshops.

The authors wish to thank the following central office staff of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for their guidance and participation in the design and conduct of the regional workshops:

- Dr. Robert Levinson, Administrator, Inmate Program Services

. Ms. Sylvia McCollum, Education Administrator

. Mr. Shelvy Johnson, Assistant Education Administrator

. Ms. Janice Andrews, Education Specialist

Additional support was provided by the following regional education administrators of the Federal Bureau of Prisons who assisted in the design and implementation of each workshop:

Dale W. Clark
Northeastern Region
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dudley E. Blevins
North Central Region
Kansas City, Missouri

Arthur R. Ellard
Southeastern Region
Atlanta, Georgia

Glen L. Henrickson
Western Region
Burlingame, California

Richard E. Cassell
South Central Region
Dallas, Texas

Finally the authors wish to acknowledge the participants who entered enthusiastically into the workshop activities. The CVE staff were impressed with their capabilities and dedication toward improving vocational education in corrections.

The Center commends the Bureau of Prisons for its efforts in personnel development of the professional staff within its institutions.

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORKSHOP CURRICULUM	3
SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS	5
EVALUATION PROCEDURES	5
Daily Evaluation	6
Final Evaluation	6
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	7
Workshop as a Whole	7
Achievement of Workshop Objectives	8
Expectations of Workshop	9
Participation and Interaction	9
Improvement of Competencies	10
Benefits Received	11
Workshop Arrangements	12
Workshop Planning and Activities	12
SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP EVALUATION	13
APPENDIX A: Agenda	A-1
APPENDIX B: Workshop Participants	B-1
APPENDIX C: Vocational Education Courses Within BOP Institutions	C-1
APPENDIX D: Evaluation Forms	D-1
APPENDIX E: Daily Evaluation Results	E-1

Introduction

The modern goal of the correctional system is not only to serve and protect the public through crime prevention, but also to provide offender rehabilitation and reintegration into the community. Since the offender population is typically poor, undereducated, and unemployed, occupational education is viewed as an effective means for providing useful employment skills and knowledges to enhance the offender's chances for success upon release.

Over 98 percent of the inmates within the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) will eventually return to society. Consequently, a major thrust of the BOP's rehabilitation effort is to equip an individual with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to lead a law-abiding, productive life upon release. To provide inmates with the necessary skills for earning a satisfactory livelihood, a variety of occupational training programs is offered. Various systems for delivering these programs are utilized by the BOP. One system involves the use of civil service employees who provide instruction for occupational education courses within BOP institutions. Another approach uses educational resources that are available within the community.

The educational leadership within the BOP believes that occupational education programs can be improved by a more appropriate use of delivery strategies and the upgrading of occupational

education staffs. To assist in implementing these improvements, the BOP requested The Center for Vocational Education to conduct a two-phase study.

During Phase I of this study, an assessment was conducted of the comparative effectiveness of a variety of approaches, including the community resource approach, for delivering occupational education. A report of the findings and recommendations was submitted to the BOP on March 5, 1976.

Phase II activities focused on the design and implementation of five regional workshops for persons with responsibilities for the delivery of occupational education in the BOP. The workshops, developed primarily from the findings of the Phase I assessment, were designed to improve programs and classroom instruction in occupational education. Specific objectives of the workshops were:

- To provide a forum for discussion of Phase I research activities and findings.
- To provide delineation and discussion of alternative delivery systems for occupational education within the BOP.
- To provide participatory interaction among the conferees regarding the improvement of occupational education within the BOP.
- To provide relevant and useful staff development training on selected topics for occupational education instructors and supervisors.

The following sections of this report are addressed to Phase II activities, including development of the workshop curriculum, selection of participants, and workshop evaluation procedures.

Development of the Workshop Curriculum

During Phase I, a vocational teacher competency questionnaire (VTCQ) was administered to assess staff development needs. The primary purpose for using the instrument was to assess the perceived staff development needs of vocational teachers for the Phase II workshops. The VTCQ was based largely upon the Vocational Teacher Competency Profile developed by The Center for Vocational Education with certain deletions and additions to make it relevant to vocational teachers in correctional institutions. The instrument was administered to 23 teachers in the BOP's institutions at Atlanta, Pleasanton, Terminal Island, and Terre Haute. The instrument consists of 75 items related to the following nine categories:

- Program Planning, Development, and Evaluation
- Instructional Planning
- Instructional Execution
- Instructional Evaluation
- Instructional Management
- Guidance
- Community Relations
- Professional Role and Development
- Correctional Environment

Vocational teachers and supervisors were interviewed at the Petersburg and Texarkana pilot sites to determine their staff development needs. Informal observations were conducted at all the institutions visited to supplement information obtained by the VTCQ and personal interviews. This information was utilized to construct a curriculum for the regional workshops. Final priorities for workshop topics were established during meetings with the workshop planning committee and staff of the Bureau's Educational Administration. Planning committee members included the following individuals:

Robert Levinson
Administrator
Inmate Program Services
Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

Sylvia G. McCollum
Education Administrator
Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

Shelvy Johnson
Assistant Education Administrator
Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

Dale W. Clark
Regional Education Administrator
Northeast Region
Bureau of Prisons
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Arthur R. Ellard
Regional Education Administrator
South Eastern Region
Bureau of Prisons
Atlanta, Georgia

Richard E. Cassell
Regional Education Administrator
South Central Region
Bureau of Prisons
Dallas, Texas

Dudley E. Blevins
Regional Education Administrator
North Central Region
Bureau of Prisons
Kansas City, Missouri

Glen Henrickson
Regional Education Administrator
Western Region
Bureau of Prisons
San Francisco, California

CVE staff met separately with Robert Levinson, Sylvia McCollum, and Shelvy Johnson of the BOP central office staff to refine topical areas for the workshop agenda. The agenda is presented in Appendix A.

Selection of Participants

Selection of participants was carried out by the office of the BOP Education Administrator. All Regional Education Administrators, Education Supervisors, and vocational coordinators were invited to participate in the workshops. Vocational teachers were selected by their corresponding Education Supervisor and approved by the appropriate Regional Education Administrator. Depending on the size of the vocational education programs, each institution in the BOP system selected up to four individuals from their vocational education staff and other related institution programs. Thus each regional workshop consisted of from 20 to 25 institutional participants representing administrative, instructional, and counseling personnel. A list of participants by region is presented in Appendix B. Appendix C lists vocational education courses and their delivery mode (i.e., whether contracted or civil service) within BOP institutions represented at the workshops.

Evaluation Procedures

Evaluation of the regional workshops was accomplished by means of questionnaires filled out by workshop participants. Two strategies were employed:

1) A daily questionnaire was designed to provide feedback to workshop staff after each day's activities. This procedure allowed the staff to make the workshops more responsive to participants' needs as the workshops progressed.

2) A final evaluation was conducted on the last day of the workshop. This evaluation focused on the workshop objectives, and participant attitudes toward various aspects of the workshop.

Copies of the daily and final evaluation forms are presented in Appendix D.

Daily Evaluation

At the end of each day's activities, participants were requested to rate the usefulness of the proceedings (e.g., presentations, small group activities, etc.) on a five point scale from (5) Very Useful to (1) Not Useful. They were also asked to identify activities of most interest to them, recommend changes for improving the workshop, and list concepts discussed that needed further explanation.

As mentioned earlier, the primary purpose of the daily evaluations was to enable the workshop staff to be responsive to participants' needs as the workshop progressed. Because they served as a basis for responsive change rather than as an indication of achievement for the total workshop activities, the daily evaluations will not be discussed in this report. The reader is referred to Appendix E for mean ratings of daily topics and activities.

Final Evaluation

The final evaluation was administered on the last day of the workshop and consisted of three sections: (1) workshop objectives,

(2) quality of the workshop, and (3) general information. Items within each of these sections were rated on a five point scale. Participants were encouraged to comment on their ratings in the space provided. The results of the final evaluation are presented below.

Data Analysis and Results

The following sections present mean ratings of evaluation items that appeared on the final evaluation form completed by participants. Mean ratings are presented for each workshop site and across sites to show regional and total impact.

Workshop as a Whole

As indicated in the data presented below the mean rating of the workshops across all sites was 4.33 or between "good" and "excellent." Four of the five workshops received a rating of greater than four. Although the rating for the first workshop in Philadelphia was above "average" (3.35), a number of modifications were made in the proceedings and activities to better meet the needs of participants. The success of these modifications is evident in the higher ratings obtained in subsequent workshops.

Workshop Sites	Mean Rating
Philadelphia	3.35
Atlanta	4.87
Dallas	4.77
Kansas City	4.57
San Francisco	4.32
All Sites	4.33

Scale:
Excellent-5, Good-4, Average-3, Fair-2, Poor-1

Achievement of Workshop Objectives

The table below shows that workshop objectives were well achieved across all sites (mean rating 3.91). Most ratings approximated or exceeded the fourth scale point. The Philadelphia workshop showed the lowest ratings but subsequent improvement raised mean ratings in the remaining four workshops to more acceptable levels and beyond.

Workshop Objectives	Workshop Sites: Philadelphia	Atlanta	Dallas	Kansas City	San Francisco	All Sites
1. To provide a forum for discussion of Phase I research activities and findings.	2.95	3.86	4.05	4.19	3.64	3.73
2. To provide delineation and discussion of alternative delivery systems for occupational education within the BOP.	3.14	3.95	4.05	4.24	3.67	3.80
3. To provide participatory interaction among the conferees regarding the improvement of occupational education within the BOP.	3.33	4.48	4.05	4.33	3.77	3.99
4. To provide relevant and useful staff development training on selected topics for occupational education instructors and supervisors.	3.33	4.48	4.44	4.29	.05	4.11
All Objectives	3.19	4.19	4.15	4.26	3.78	3.91

Scale: Extremely Well 5
4
Adequately 3
2
Not at All 1

Expectations of Workshop

Participant expectations of the workshops were generally well met across sites (mean rating 3.86) in spite of the heterogeneity of the participants. The lower rating for the Philadelphia workshop was improved upon significantly in the remaining four sites.

Workshop Sites	Mean Rating
Philadelphia	2.90
Atlanta	4.26
Dallas	4.25
Kansas City	4.10
San Francisco	3.91
All Sites	3.86

Scale:		
	Extremely Well	5
		4
	Adequately	3
		2
	Not at All	1

Participation and Interaction

The extent to which opportunities were provided for BOP education staff to participate in workshop proceedings and to interact professionally with CVE staff and other participants was rated very favorably across sites (mean rating 4.30). All sites showed uniformly high ratings on each of these variables.

Participation and Interaction	Workshop Sites: Philadelphia	Atlanta	Dallas	Kansas City	San Francisco	All Sites
Opportunities to participate*	4.10	4.35	4.24	4.33	3.86	4.17
Professional interaction with CVE staff and other participants**	4.10	4.81	4.53	4.52	4.23	4.44
All Activities	4.10	4.59	4.38	4.43	4.05	4.30

Scale:
*Very Great-5, Much-4, Some-3, Little-2, Very Little-1
**Excellent-5, Good-4, Average-3, Fair-2, Poor-1

Improvement of Competencies

The following mean ratings show the extent to which participants felt their competencies had been improved as a result of attending the workshops. Across all sites, the mean rating was 3.63 or approximately midway between the categories of "some" and "much." With the exception of the first workshop in Philadelphia, ratings on this variable were generally favorable at each site.

Workshop Sites	Mean Rating
Philadelphia	2.90
Atlanta	3.70
Dallas	4.11
Kansas City	3.70
San Francisco	3.82
All Sites	3.63

Scale:
Very Much-5, Much-4, Some-3, Little-2, Very Little-1

Benefits Received

Participants were asked to list three outcomes or benefits they received by attending the workshop. The table below presents the responses most frequently cited.

- Sharing information and ideas with participants from other BOP institutions. Participants also cited the visit to a nearby BOP institution as providing a particularly interesting experience.
- Information on course organization and course design. Coping skills were frequently mentioned as being a much needed topic for workshop discussion.
- Resource materials and sources of information. This included the handout materials as well as information on other sources of materials.

Benefits Received	Workshop Sites: Philadelphia	Atlanta	Dallas	Kansas City	San Francisco	All Sites
Meeting other BOP participants and sharing information	16	14	9	12	12	63
Information on course organization and course design	15	13	7	11	17	63
Resource materials and sources of information	14	8	7	9	15	52

Note: Entries in this table are frequencies of participant responses.

Workshop Arrangements

Arrangements for the workshops involved a number of planning decisions related to informing, registering, and housing participants. The data presented below show that these arrangements were very successful across all sites (mean rating 4.28). The mean rating across the four variables was between "good" and "excellent" for each of the five sites.

Arrangements	Workshop Sites: Philadelphia	Atlanta	Dallas	Kansas City	San Francisco	All Sites
Advanced Information	4.00	4.36	4.27	4.15	3.86	4.13
Registration Procedures	4.43	4.52	4.52	4.48	4.47	4.48
Meeting Room	3.62	3.86	4.33	4.19	4.10	4.01
Accommodations	4.30	4.38	4.64	4.70	4.58	4.52
All Arrangements	4.08	4.28	4.44	4.38	4.24	4.28

Scale:
Excellent-5, Good-4, Average-3, Fair-2, Poor-1

Workshop Planning and Activities

A number of items on the final evaluation were clustered into the following matrix to reflect the quality of workshop planning and activities. The data presented below show that, across all

sites and variables, a mean rating of 4.33 or between "good" and "excellent" was achieved. Gain in mean ratings between Philadelphia and subsequent workshops is apparent in workshop planning and activities as it has been for other workshop variables.

Workshop Planning and Activities	Workshop Sites: Philadelphia	Atlanta	Dallas	Kansas City	San Francisco	All Sites
Choice of topics	3.33	4.45	4.61	4.48	4.27	4.22
Content (usefulness, comprehensiveness, and clarity of the information presented)	3.48	4.52	4.50	4.52	4.32	4.26
Presentations (variety, sequency, A/V support, and time alloted)	3.38	4.33	4.33	4.05	4.23	4.06
Presenters (preparation, effectiveness, and responsiveness to participant needs)	3.63	4.76	4.77	4.67	4.64	4.50
Printed materials	4.48	4.50	4.72	4.76	4.64	4.62
All Planning and Activities	3.66	4.51	4.59	4.50	4.42	4.33

Scale:
Excellent-5, Good-4, Average-3, Fair-2, Poor-1

Summary of Workshop Evaluation

A review of the final evaluation ratings indicates that participants viewed the workshop proceedings very favorably. Except for the first workshop in Philadelphia, ratings at each

of the workshop sites were between four (good) and five (excellent). Participants were generally impressed with the accommodations, presentations, presenters, and the handout material provided.

One of the factors that undoubtedly influenced the participant ratings was the heterogeneity of the workshop participants as indicated by the roles revealed in Appendix B. For instance, a subject that was of interest to an administrator might not be of interest to a teacher. This is also revealed in the close correlation between participant expectations and overall ratings.

The Philadelphia workshop was of some concern since the daily and final ratings were generally just above the "average" or "adequate" category (i.e., between 3 and 4). To remedy this situation, debriefings were held for CVE and BOP staff following each day's activities. Strategies were worked out to improve workshop activities based in large part on the daily evaluations provided by the participants. As a result, a number of changes were made in the remaining four workshops regarding choice of topics and other workshop activities. Ratings for these workshops show that improvement was achieved where needed.

APPENDIX A

Agenda

WORKSHOP FOR IMPROVING OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
IN THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

Program

Sunday

7:30 - 10:00 p.m.	Registration and Social Hour

Monday

8:00 a.m.	Welcome
	Presider BOP Regional Administrator/Director BOP Central Office BOP Regional Educational Administrator
	Workshop Orientation
	Introduction of Participants
10:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
	Review of Phase I Report
	Findings Recommendations
12:00 noon	Lunch
1:00 p.m.	Principles of Vocational Education
	Program Resources and Development
2:45 p.m.	Coffee Break
	Advisory Committees
	Types Functions Members
4:30 p.m.	Summary and Daily Evaluation

Tuesday

8:00 a.m.	Announcements and Evaluation Feedback
	Vocational Course Design
	Job Descriptions Target Population Course Descriptions Philosophy
10:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
	Course Objectives
12:00 noon	Lunch
1:00 p.m.	Vocational Course Design (cont'd)
	Trade Analysis
2:45 p.m.	Coffee Break
	Course Outlines Teaching Content/Sequence
4:30 p.m.	Summary and Daily Evaluation

Wednesday

8:00 a.m.	Announcements and Evaluation Feedback
	Vocational Course Design (cont'd)
	Lesson Plans
10:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
	Lesson Plans (cont'd) Evaluation of Students
12:00 noon	Lunch

Afternoon is devoted to an institutional tour.

Thursday

8:00 a.m.	Announcements and Evaluation Feedback
	Coping Skills
	Professional and Instructional Resources
10:00 a.m.	Coffee Break
	Use of Media in Vocational Education
	Workshop Summary and Final Evaluation
12:00 noon	Lunch
1:00 p.m.	BOP Regional Meeting

APPENDIX B

Workshop Participants

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Northeast Region: Philadelphia

BOP Central Office Staff

Robert Levinson, Administrator, Inmate Program Services

Sylvia McCollum, Education Administrator

Janice Andrews, Education Specialist

Dennis Hubbard, Staff Training

BOP Northeast Regional Staff

Dale Clark, Regional Education Administrator

Clarence Guienze, Executive Assistant

Peter Hecht, Assistant Administrator, Case Management

BOP Institutional Staff--Northeast Region

Federal Correctional Institution
Danbury, Connecticut

Cecil Nave, Supervisor of Education
Charles Cohen, Related Trades Instructor
Mary Araya, Supportive Education Instructor
James Mahon, Vocational Training Instructor

Federal Reformatory
Petersburg, Virginia

Calvin Jacobs, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Richard Blankenship, V.T. Coordinator
William Gentry, Machine Shop Instructor

U.S. Penitentiary
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

Harold Toevs, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Fred Schobert, Vocational Counselor
James Youngman, Education Specialist

Federal Reformatory for Women
Alderson, West Virginia

Margaret Hambrick, Supervisor of Education
Joe Salisbury, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Joseph McNutt, ADP Instructor
William Boyd, Medical Technology Instructor

Federal Prison Camp
Allenwood, Pennsylvania

Carl Dooley, Supervisor of Education
Louis Gregory, Educational and Vocational Advisor

Federal Youth Center
Morgantown, West Virginia

John Davis, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Larry See, Instructor
Donna Tenney, Instructor

Metropolitan Correctional Center
New York, New York

Robert Harris, Supervisor of Education

Southeast Region: Atlanta

BOP Central Office Staff

Sylvia McCollum, Education Administrator

BOP Southeast Regional Staff

Arthur Ellard, Regional Education Administrator

BOP Institutional Staff--Southeast Region

U.S. Penitentiary
Atlanta, Georgia

Donald G. Porterfield, Supervisor of Education
William C. Strong, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Jerry E. Pounds, Vocational Training Coordinator
R. H. Evans, Heating and Air Conditioning Instructor
J. T. Kelly, Auto Mechanic Instructor

Federal Correctional Institution
Butner, North Carolina

David Seyler, Supervisor of Education

Federal Correctional Institution
Lexington, Kentucky

James Stephens, Vocational Coordinator
Fred Gardner, Media Specialist
Katie Jefferson, Education Specialist

Federal Prison Camp
Montgomery, Alabama

David Ketner, Supervisor of Education

Medical Center for Federal Prisoners
Springfield, Missouri

Gary Driver, Vocational Coordinator

Federal Youth Center
Miami, Florida

James B. Jones, Supervisor of Education
Jerry McKenzie, Vocational Training Coordinator

Federal Youth Center
Ashland, Kentucky

James T. Sammons, Supervisor of Education
John Hofstee, Vocational Coordinator
Roberta Stewart, Auto Service Station Attendant Instructor
Lester Pierce, Auto Mechanic Instructor

Federal Correctional Institution
Tallahassee, Florida

Davy Edwards, Supervisor of Education
William Lansberry, Relief Instructor
William Meusch, Related Trades Instructor
Larry Watts, Audio-Visual Instructor

Federal Prison Camp
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida

Joe Cyrus, Supervisor of Education

South Central Region: Dallas

BOP Central Office Staff

Shelvy Johnson, Assistant Education Administrator

BOP South Central Regional Staff

Richard Cassell, Regional Education Administrator

Charles J. Hughes, Regional Director

BOP Institutional Staff--South Central Region

Federal Correctional Institution
La Tuna, Texas

Les Dingess, Supervisor of Education
Carl Myllo, Related Trades Instructor
Henry Fiol, Welding Instructor

Federal Reformatory
El Reno, Oklahoma

Lex Enyart, Supervisor of Education
James Thornton, Machine Shop Instructor
Gaylord Redemer, Welding Instructor

Federal Correctional Institution
Fort Worth, Texas

Bob Clark, Supervisor of Education
Elliot Caggins, Related Trades Instructor
Ella Colley, Education Specialist

Federal Correctional Institution
Seagoville, Texas

Norman Langdon, Supervisor of Education
Lee Carson, Automotive Instructor
James Eberly, Related Trades Instructor

Federal Correctional Institution
Texarkana, Texas

Richard O. Williams, Supervisor of Education
Melvin Brown, Related Trades Instructor
James Gorum, V.T. Coordinator
Ron Boatright, Teacher Coordinator
David Jackson, Small Engine Mechanics Instructor
Harry Martin, Auto Mechanics Instructor
Arthur Purdy, Welding Instructor
William Purifoy, Refrigeration Mechanics Instructor

North Central Region: Kansas City

BOP Central Office Staff

Robert Levinson, Administrator, Inmate Program Services

BOP North Central Regional Staff

Dudley E. Blevins, Regional Education Administrator

James D. Henderson, Regional Director

BOP Institutional Staff--North Central Region

Federal Correctional Institution
Sandstone, Minnesota

Lonnie Moore, Supervisor of Education
Dale Frye, Welding Instructor
James Hayes, Jr., Related Trades Instructor
Jack Bean, Drafting Instructor

Federal Correctional Institution
Milan, Michigan

Bruce Baker, Assistant Supervisor of Education
John Miskerik, Jr., Industrial Trades Instructor

Federal Correctional Institution
Oxford, Wisconsin

Ted Cleavinger, Supervisor of Education

U.S. Penitentiary
Marion, Illinois

Richard Williams, Supervisor of Education
James Streed, Related Trades (Occupational Coordinator)

U.S. Penitentiary
Terre Haute, Indiana

George Boeringa, Supervisor of Education
Harold Greenwood, Welding Instructor
Glen Smith, Related Trades Teacher
Wilfred Molen, Farm Machine Repair V.T. Instructor

Metropolitan Correctional Center
Chicago, Illinois

Katherine Hogan, Education Coordinator

U.S. Penitentiary
Leavenworth, Kansas

Dave Swyhart, Supervisor of Education
Charles Huff, Vocational Training Supervisor
John Fowler, Climate Control Teacher
Michael Beall, Related Trades Teacher

Medical Center for Federal Prisoners
Springfield, Missouri

Tom McFerren, Supervisor of Education
Fred Prior, Small Engines Instructor

Western Region: San Francisco

BOP Central Office Staff

Sylvia McCollum, Education Administrator

BOP Western Regional Staff

Paul T. Walker, Regional Director

Glen L. Henrickson, Regional Education Administrator

BOP Institutional Staff--Western Region

Federal Correctional Institution
Terminal Island, California

Don Butts, Supervisor of Education
Melvin Couch, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Ophelia Norman, Business Skills Instructor

U.S. Penitentiary
McNeil Island, Washington

Joe Palmquist, Supervisor of Education
Edward Earley, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Damon Stewart, Small Engine Instructor

Federal Prison Camp
Safford, Arizona

Frank Romero, Supervisor of Education

Metropolitan Correctional Center
San Diego, California

Antonio Perez, Supervisor of Education

Federal Youth Center
Pleasanton, California

Harold Kahler, Supervisor of Education
Carl Hungate, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Roy Isler, Coordinator of Amador Valley School District
Diana Bertani, Business Skills Instructor
John Mangini, Auto Shop, Small Engine Instructor
Fred Layton, Welding Instructor

Federal Youth Center
Englewood, Colorado

Jim Wallace, Supervisor of Education
Dale Doshier, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Donald Nauerth, Arts & Crafts Instructor
Carl Fairbanks, Auto Body Repair Instructor

Federal Correctional Institution
Lompoc, California

Don Scott, Supervisor of Education
Mike Malone, Assistant Supervisor of Education
Russell Hinkens, Machine Shop Instructor
Richard Grossman, Electronics Instructor

APPENDIX C

Vocational Education Courses
Within BOP Institutions

Vocational Education Courses Within BOP Institutions*

Northeast Region

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Youth Center Morgantown, West Virginia		
	Automotive	Civil Service
	Welding	"
	Machine Shop	"
	Graphics	"
	Electricity/Electronics	"
	Air Conditioning/Refrigeration	"
	Construction/Maintenance	"
	Drafting	"
	Business Education	"
	ADP	"
Federal Reformatory Petersburg, Virginia		
	Auto Mechanics (PTU/VT)	Civil Service
	Welding	"
	Machine Shop	"
	Masonry	"
	Auto Body (PTU/VT)	"
	Air Conditioning	"
	Barbering	Vocational Rehabilitation

*This information was provided by workshop participants.

C-1

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Reformatory for Women Alderson, West Virginia		
	Home Economics	Civil Service
	Business Education	"
	ADP Keypunch	"
	Medical Technology	"
	Drafting	Contract--Individual
	Medical Clerical	Civil Service
	Nurse's Aid Training	Contract--Summers County Vocational School
Federal Correctional Institution Danbury, Connecticut		
	Small Engine Repair	Civil Service
	Typing and Business Machines	Contract--Individual
	Welding	Civil Service
	Truck Driver Training	Contract--Individual
	Offset Printing	" "
U.S. Penitentiary Lewisburg, Pennsylvania		
	Dental Technician	Civil Service/Contract--Williamsport Area Community College
	Carpet Laying	Contract--Individual
	Masonry	" "
	Small Engine	" "
	Automatic Heat and Air Conditioning	Civil Service
	Food Service Management	Contract--Williamsport Area Community College

C-2

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
U.S. Penitentiary (cont'd) Lewisburg, Pennsylvania		
	Building and Construction Estimating	Contract--Penn State University
	Electrical Power Systems	" "
	Apprenticeship	
	Cooking	Civil Serivce
	Baking	"
	Electronic Equipment Mechanic	"
	Drafting Engineering	"
	Drafting Tool Design	"
	Tool & Die Making	"
	Sewing Machine Repair	"
	Precision Machinist	"

Southeast Region

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution Tallahassee, Florida		
	Auto Mechanics	Civil Service
	Auto Body Repair	"
	Masonry	"
	Welding	"
	Machine Shop	"
	Woodworking	"
	Drafting	"
	Custodial	"
	Apprenticeship	
	Masonry	"
	Auto Body	"
	Auto Mechanics	"
	Electrical	"
	Plumbing	"
	Power Plant	"
	Millman	"
	Food Preparation	"
Federal Youth Center Ashland, Kentucky		
	Auto Mechanics	Civil Service
	Auto Body and Fender Repair	"
	Electronics	"
	Printing	"
	Drafting	"
	Audio/Visual Communications	"
	Photography	"

C-4

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Prison Camp, Maxwell Montgomery, Alabama		
	Welding	Contract--Individual
	Floor & Wall Covering	" "
U.S. Penitentiary Atlanta, Georgia		
	Auto Tune Up/Auto Air Conditioning (day)	Civil Service
	Auto Transmission/Brakes and Alignment (day)	"
	Small Engine	"
	Masonry	"
	Welding (day)	"
	Heating and Air Conditioning	"
	Barbering	Contract--Atlanta Area Technical School
	Auto Tune Up/Auto Air Conditioning (night)	" "
	Auto Brakes and Alignment (night)	" "
	Welding (night)	" "
Federal Correctional Institution Lexington, Kentucky		
	Dental Assistant	Civil Service
	Clinical Lab	"
	Nurses' Aide	Contract--Individual
	X-Ray Technician	Civil Service
	Physical Therapy	"
	Apprenticeship	
	Brick Layer	"
	Carpenter	"

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution (cont'd) Lexington, Kentucky		
	Plumbing	Civil Service
	Painter	"
	Cabinet Maker	"
	Air Conditioning/Refrigeration Mechanic	"
	Baker	"
	Cook (hotel)	"
	Electrician	"
	Sheet Metal Worker	"
	Draftsman	"
	Auto Mechanic	"
	Machinist	"
	Meat Cutter	"
	Dental Technician	"
	Powerhouse Operator	"

South Central Region

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution Texarkana, Texas		
	Small Engine Repair	Contract--Texarkana Community College
	Auto Mechanic	"
	Welding	"
	Air Conditioning	"
	Drafting	Civil Service
	Brakes & AC	"
	Auto Tune Up	"
	Transmissions	"
	Auto Electrical Systems	"
Federal Correctional Institution Fort Worth, Texas		
	Child Development	Contract--Tarrant County Junior College/Children's Television Workshop
	Human Resource Aide	Contract--Tarrant County Junior College
	Drafting	"
	Office Skills	"
	Key Punch	Civil Service
	Graphic Arts (PTU)*	"
	Ironworking	Contract--Tarrant County Junior College

*Production Training Unit

C-7

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution (cont'd) Fort Worth, Texas		
	Building Maintenance (BAT)*	
	Air Conditioning	Civil Service
	Electrical	"
	Carpentry	"
	Painting	"
	Plumbing	"
	TV Production	"
	Electronics	Contract--Tarrant County Junior College
	Career Guidance	Civil Service
Federal Correctional Institution El Reno, Oklahoma		
	Food Service	Civil Service
	Meat Processing	"
	Machine Shop	"
	Welding	"
	Auto Mechanics	"
	Drafting	"
	Blueprint Reading	"
		"
Federal Correctional Institution Seagoville, Texas		
	Welding	Civil Serivce
	Auto Mechanics	"
	Machine Shop	"
	Radio & TV Repair	Contract--Individual
	Small Gas Engine	Contract--Individual
	Child Development	Contract--Children's Television Workshop/ El Centro Community College

*Bureau of Apprenticeship Training

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution La Tuna, Texas		
	Air Conditioning & Refrigeration	Contract--Individual
	Artificial Insemination	Contract--El Paso Community College
	Auto Mechanics	Civil Service
	Building Maintenance & Repair	Contract--El Paso Community College
	Building Trades	" "
	Dairy Production	" "
	Farm Machinery	" "
	Masonry	Contract--Individual
	Sign Painting	" "
	Welding	Civil Service

C-9

North Central Region

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
U.S. Penitentiary Leavenworth, Kansas		
	Heating/Air Conditioning/ Refrigeration	Contract--Individual
	Electronics	" "
	Graphic Arts	
	Offset Press	" "
	Silk Screening	" "
	Computer Training	Civil Service
	Residential Contracting (Wood Frame Houses)	Contract--Individual
Medical Center for Federal Prisoners Springfield, Missouri		
	Medical Lab Technician	Civil Service
	X-ray Technician	"
	Operating Room Technician	Civil Service/Contract-- Individual
	Hospital Attendent	" "
	Small Engine Repair	Civil Service
	Transaxles	"
U.S. Penitentiary Marion, Illinois		
	Welding	John A. Logan Community College
	Auto Mechanic	" " "
	Apprenticeship (BAT)	
	Printing	Civil Service

Institution	Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution Oxford, Wisconsin		
	Drafting	Civil Service
	Food Service	"
	Auto Mechanic	"
	Welding	"
	Small Engine Repair	"
Federal Correctional Institution Sandstone, Minnesota		
	Mechanical Drafting	Civil Service
	Auto Mechanic	"
	Welding	"
Federal Correctional Institution Milan, Michigan		
	Building Trades	Civil Service
	Automotive Services	"
	Industrial Trades	"
	Computer Program	Contract--Washtenaw Community College
U.S. Penitentiary Terre Haute, Indiana		
	Welding	Contract--Individual
	Small Engine Repair	" "
	Data Processing	Contract--Indiana Vocational Technical College
	Welding	Civil Service
	Farm Machine Repair	"
	V.T. Lab	"

Western Region

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution Lompoc, California		
	Barbering	Contract--Allan Hancock Community College
	Electronics	Civil Service
	Heating & Air Conditioning	"
	Machine Shop	"
	Small Engine Repair	Contract--Allen Hancock Community College
	Meat Processing	Civil Service
	Welding	"
	Machine Apprenticeship Program	"
U.S. Penitentiary McNeil Island, Washington		
	V.T. Basic Electronics	Civil Service
	Welding	"
	Machine Shop	"
	Barber College	"
	Small Engine Repair	"
	Radio/TV Repair	Contract--Bates Vocational-Technical School
	Welding (evening)	" "
Federal Correctional Institution Terminal Island, California		
	Business Education	Civil Service
	IBM Keypunch	Contract--Individual
	Welding	" "
	Drafting	" "

Institution	Vocational Education Course	Delivery Mode
Federal Correctional Institution Englewood, Colorado		
	Welding	Civil Service
	Auto Body Repair	"
	Building Trades	"
	Auto Mechanics	"
	Business Education	"
	Media Services	"
Federal Correctional Institution Pleasanton, California		
	Alignment Mechanic	Contract--Amador Valley High School District
	Diagnostic Technician	" "
	Basic Welding	" "
	Advanced Welding	" "
	Basic Business Skills	" "
	Advanced Welding Skills	" "

APPENDIX D

Evaluation Forms

Please indicate your position:

education supervisor____
instructor____
other (specify)_____
_____

DAILY FEEDBACK

Monday

Indicate the extent to which the following activities will be useful to you in your work setting.

	5 Very Useful	4	3 Somewhat Useful	2	1 Not Useful
1. Review of Phase I Report Findings Recommendations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Principles of Vocational Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Program Resources and Development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Advisory Committees Types Functions Members	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Your daily comments on the following items will help the workshop staff improve the workshop as it progresses.

1. What aspects of today's session were of most interest to you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How could today's session have been improved?

3. What new terms or concepts discussed during today's session need further explanation?

Please indicate your position:

education supervisor____
instructor____
other (specify)_____
_____

DAILY FEEDBACK

Tuesday

Indicate the extent to which the following activities will be useful to you in your work setting.

	5 Very Useful	4	3 Somewhat Useful	2	1 Not Useful
1. Vocational Course Design	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job Descriptions Target Population Course Descriptions Philosophy Course Objectives					
2. Vocational Course Design	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Trade Analysis Course Outlines Teaching Content/Sequence					

Your daily comments on the following items will help the workshop staff improve the workshop as it progresses.

1. What aspects of today's session were of most interest to you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How could today's session have been improved?

3. What new terms or concepts discussed during today's session need further explanation?

Please indicate your position:

education supervisor____
instructor____
other (specify)_____
_____

DAILY FEEDBACK

Wednesday

Indicate the extent to which the following activities will be useful to you in your work setting.

	5 Very Useful	4	3 Somewhat Useful	2	1 Not Useful
1. Vocational Course Design	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Lesson Plans
Evaluation of Students

Your daily comments on the following items will help the workshop staff improve the workshop as it progresses.

1. What aspects of today's session were of most interest to you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How could today's session have been improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. What new terms or concepts discussed during today's session need further explanation?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please indicate your position:

education supervisor____
instructor____
other (specify)_____
_____

DAILY FEEDBACK

Thursday

Indicate the extent to which the following activities will be useful to you in your work setting.

	5 Very Useful	4	3 Somewhat Useful	2	1 Not Useful
1. Coping Skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Professional and Instructional Resources	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Use of Media in Vocational Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Your daily comments on the following items will help the workshop staff improve the workshop as it progresses.

1. What aspects of today's session were of most interest to you?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How could today's session have been improved?

3. What new terms or concepts discussed during today's session need further explanation?

EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP
FOR IMPROVING OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
WITHIN THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

FINAL EVALUATION

Please take a few minutes to fill out this evaluation of the workshop. Your answers are strictly voluntary and should be completely frank. Do not sign your name. The information that you provide will help the workshop staff evaluate the quality of the total workshop activities. Your responses will not be identified individually in any manner and the completed evaluation forms will be destroyed after the data is compiled by the CVE staff.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Please indicate your position:

education supervisor____
instructor____
other (specify)_____

_____

THE CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
The Ohio State University • 1960 Kenny Road • Columbus, Ohio 43210

SECTION I: WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Indicate by circling the appropriate rating, how well the following workshop objectives were achieved.

Objective	Extremely Well		Adequately		Not At All
1. To provide a forum for discussion of Phase I research activities and findings.	5	4	3	2	1
2. To provide delineation and discussion of alternative delivery systems for occupational education within the BOP.	5	4	3	2	1
3. To provide participatory interaction among the conferees regarding the improvement of occupational education within the FBP.	5	4	3	2	1
4. To provide relevant and useful staff development training on selected topics for occupational education instructors and supervisors.	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION II: QUALITY OF THE WORKSHOP

Rate the various areas of the workshop by circling the appropriate rating for each area. We encourage you to comment on your ratings in the space provided.

		QUALITY RATING				
		Excellent	Good	Aver-age	Fair	Poor
1.	Advanced workshop information	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
2.	Registration procedures	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
3.	Meeting room	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
4.	Accommodations	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
5.	Choice of workshop topics	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
6.	Special programs	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					

		QUALITY RATING				
		Excellent	Good	Aver-age	Fair	Poor
7.	Content (usefulness, comprehensiveness, and clarity of the information presented)	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
8.	Presentations (variety, sequency, A/V support, and time alloted)	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
9.	Presenters (preparation, effectiveness, and responsiveness to participants' needs)	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
10.	Printed materials	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
11.	Professional interaction with presenters and other participants on problems of personal interest	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					
12.	Workshop as a whole	5	4	3	2	1
	Comment: _____					
	_____					

SECTION III: GENERAL INFORMATION

Circle the most appropriate response for each question. We encourage you to comment on your responses in the space provided.

1. How well did the workshop meet the expectations you had before you came?

5	4	3	2	1
Extremely Well		Adequately		Not at All

Comment: _____

_____

2. How appropriate was the instruction for you?

a.

5	4	3	2	1
Too Technical		Just Right		Too Elementary

b.

5	4	3	2	1
Too Formal		Just Right		Too Informal

c.

5	4	3	2	1
Well Individualized		Adequately Individualized		Not Individualized

Comment: _____

_____

3. How much do you feel your competencies have improved as a result of attending this workshop?

5	4	3	2	1
Very Much	Much	Some	Little	Very Little

Comment: _____

_____

4. To what extent were there opportunities for everyone to participate?

5	4	3	2	1
Very Great	Much	Some	Little	Very Little

Comment: _____

_____

5. How many days do you feel this workshop should have been to be effective?

_____days

6. List three outcomes or benefits you received by attending the workshop.

a. _____

_____

b. _____

_____

c. _____

_____

APPENDIX E

Daily Evaluation Results

MEAN RATINGS OF WORKSHOP TOPICS

Workshop Topics	Workshop Sites: Atlanta	Dallas	Kansas City	San Francisco	All Sites
Review of Phase I Report	3.64	4.21	3.90	3.71	3.85
Principals of Vocational Education	3.74	4.11	4.35	3.52	3.92
Program Resources and Development	4.04	4.26	4.50	3.67	4.11
Advisory Committees Types Functions Members	3.70	4.37	3.80	4.52	4.20
Vocational Course Design Job Descriptions Target Populations Course Descriptions Philosophy Course Objectives	4.73	4.79	4.58	4.52	4.65
Vocational Course Design Trade Analysis Course Outlines Teaching Content/Sequence	4.64	4.84	4.58	4.57	4.65
Vocational Course Design Lesson Plans Evaluation of Students	4.74	4.39	4.55	4.57	4.61
Coping Skills	4.20	4.50	4.47	4.60	4.44
Professional and Instructional Resources	4.43	4.56	4.74	4.57	4.57
Use of Media in Vocational Education	*	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.29
TOTAL	4.20	4.44	4.44	4.24	4.33

Scale: Very Useful 5
4
Somewhat Useful 3
2
Not Useful 1

*The topic "Use of Media in Vocational Education" was added to the agenda of the last three workshops upon sponsor request.

Note: Mean ratings for the Philadelphia workshop are not shown because of subsequent changes made in the rating scale and organization of topics.

OE 009 721